REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed June 3, 2004. Claim 1 is amended, and new claims 2-20 are added. Claims 1-20 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Baker*, et al (United States Patent No. 6,493,761). Because *Baker* does not teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claim, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the following remarks.

Baker, et al. teaches "determinin[g] the presence of [protocol description files] and, if [protocol description files] are found...extracti[ng] the protocol and associated control record information from all of the [protocol description files] found." "If no [protocol description files] are found, the process is complete and control returns to the BaseProtocol setup logic, at step 603." Col. 19, lines 28-33. The BaseProtocol setup logic is defined by various steps illustrated in Figure 8. Col. 18, lines 61-63. Specifically, regarding the BaseProtocal setup logic, Baker, et al. teaches:

[T]he BaseProtocol Setup commences at step 500. At step 502, a lookup array Control Record, with a size equal to the maximum

value that can be expressed in a character of the defined byte size, plus two, is allocated. For a one-byte character set, such as ASCII, the lookup array size is 257 decimal. A Protocol Control Record, as defined in Table 2, is created and titled "BaseProtocol." A Field Sub-Record, as defined in Table 3, is created and titled "field 0." A Lookup Array, with a size equal to the number of characters in the character definition, is associated with the field sub-record and field 0 is inserted in BaseProtocol. The BaseProtocol's iso_layer is set to indicate that it is the BaseProtocol. At step 503, the lookup_array entries for any Multi-Byte Control Character Protocols are set up.

Col. 19, lines 10-24.

In direct contrast, the rejected claim specifically recites "providing a user with a protocol editor for creating a new message protocol type in the protocol definition file if at least one protocol type of at least one message contained within the data frame from the plurality of message protocol types is not defined by at least one of the plurality of message protocol types in the second definition construct...."

Because *Baker*, *et al.* does not teach the method being claimed in this application, specifically at least "providing a user with a protocol editor for creating a new message protocol type in the protocol definition file if [a] protocol type...is not defined by at least one of the plurality of message protocol types...,"Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 3rd day of December, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

EZ-Manly

ERIC L. MASCHOFF Registration No. 36,596

Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

Telephone: (801) 533-9800

W:\15436\15\KJB0000004615V001.doc